

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ABDUL H. ABDULLAH,

Plaintiff,

24-cv-124 (JGK)

- against -

ORDER

28TH PRECINCT, ET AL.,

Defendants.

JOHN G. KOELTL, District Judge:

The Court has received from the plaintiff the attached objection to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation (ECF No. 50). The time for the defendants to respond is **June 30, 2025**. The defendant may reply by **July 14, 2025**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
June 16, 2025



John G. Koeltl
United States District Judge

Abdullah Abdul Haqq
1350 5th Ave 6B
New York , New York , 10026
Timebandit211@gmail.com
929-342-3525

Date 05-28-2025



Clerk of Court
United States District Court for The Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York , 10007

Re: Objection to Judge's Decision - Case No. 24-CV-124

Dear Honorable John G. Koeltl and Barbra Moses

I am writing to formally object to the recent decision made by this Honorable Court in the above-referenced case. This objection is based on newly discovered evidence that was not available at the time of the original ruling. The new information raises significant questions about the validity of the court's prior findings and warrants reconsideration under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Basis for Objection

1. Newly Discovered Evidence:

On 05-20-2025, I obtained evidence that was not previously accessible, which directly impacts key aspects of my case. Specifically, this new evidence includes [without Due Process and Equal Access to Justice Abdullah Abdul Haqq can not Provide the necessary task of Answering the Inrogatory Discovery needed more time to answer the Motion to Compel in a timely manner because of his vision was restricted because he was under Doctors Care and couldn't understand what was necessary to prepare his documentation he attempted to notify the court he needed more time . This material fact could significantly alter the outcome if considered by this court.
See: attachment (A) Extension of Time

2. Probable Cause and Reasonable Articulate Suspicion:

Under applicable legal standards, including probable cause and reasonable articulable suspicion as recognized in various precedents (e.g., *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)), parties must have an opportunity to present all relevant facts before a ruling can be justifiably rendered. The absence of this crucial piece undermines any conclusions drawn without it.

3. Equal Access to Justice:

It is fundamental that all parties are afforded equal access to justice as guaranteed by both statutory law and constitutional principles. Denying consideration of newly discovered evidence would contravene these principles by perpetuating an unjust result based on incomplete information.

4. Due Process:

Furthermore, under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, litigants are entitled to fair procedures when their rights are at stake (see *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)). Failing to take into account newly discovered material infringing

Abdul Hossain
All rights reserved and not prejudice
UCC 1-208 without recourse

Abdul Hossain Abdul Hossain
Abdul Hossain Abdul Hossain

HOSSAIN MOHAMMED N
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF NEW YORK
01HO6356839
QUALIFIED IN QUEENS COUNTY
COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 10, 2029

date - 06-02-2025